

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

| | | |
|----------------------|---|-------------------|
| WILLIAM ZUCK, |) | 4:12CV3252 |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | MEMORANDUM |
| |) | AND ORDER |
| MARIO PEART, et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's "Motion for Extension of Time to Serve Defendants." (Filing No. [43](#).) Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires the court to extend the time for service if a "plaintiff shows good cause for the failure [to serve]." [Fed. R. Civ. P. 4\(m\)](#). Plaintiff's allegations, when liberally construed, show good cause for Plaintiff's failure to serve Defendants within 120 days. Accordingly,

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff will be given 60 days from the date of this Memorandum and Order to complete service of process on Defendants.
2. If Plaintiff does not complete service of process within 60 days, his claims against any unserved defendants may be dismissed without prejudice and without further notice, and this action will proceed only as to Plaintiff's claims against the defendants who have been served.
3. The clerk's office is directed to set a pro se case management deadline with the following text: March 6, 2014: Deadline for Plaintiff to complete service of process.

4. Plaintiff's "Motion for Extension of Time to Serve Defendants" (Filing No. [43](#)) is granted only to the extent that it is consistent with this Memorandum and Order.

DATED this 6th day of January, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

Richard G. Kopf

Senior United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.